

⑥ Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

051029 FEB 9 2006

No.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

**MARCUS ROBINSON,**

*Petitioner.*

vs.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

*Respondent.*

---

**ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

---

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

Marcus Robinson  
Petitioner  
05992-02  
P.O. Box 12014  
Terre Haute, IN 47801

## **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

Petitioner was sentenced under mandatory guidelines prior to this Court's *Booker* decision and his statutory maximum sentence was enhanced based on facts not charged in indictment, not submitted to a jury, and not proven beyond a reasonable doubt, or admitted by petitioner. At sentencing he raised a Sixth Amendment challenge but in briefing on direct appeal, still prior to this Court's *Booker* decision, he did not raise a Sixth Amendment challenge to his sentence in the Court of Appeals. He did, however, raise the challenge in a petition for Writ of Certiorari with this Court and his case was subsequently remanded by this Court for further consideration in light of *Booker* where his case was subsequently dismissed, without even plain error review, on the grounds that his failure to raise a *Booker* claim earlier "waived" the claim.

1.) Does the failure to raise the Sixth Amendment challenge in his initial direct appeal brief "waive" the claim, precluding even plain error review or relief as held by the court below and the Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, in conflict with the decisions of every one of the other courts of appeals to have considered the question?

2.) Should the District Court be granted the initial opportunity to review and correct petitioner's 'pipeline case' Sixth Amendment violations under *Booker* before affirmation of the sentence by the Court of Appeals, as the Second, Third, and Ninth Circuits have held, in conflict with the decision below and the decisions of the other courts of appeals?

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**  
**IN THE COURT BELOW**

The parties to the proceedings in the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit were as follows:  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff-Appellee, v.  
MARCUS A. ROBINSON, DENNIS K. MILES, CHAD J.  
ROBINSON, FRANCIS D. HAYDEN, Defendants-  
Appellants.

No party is a company, corporation, or subsidiary of any company or corporation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page:</u>
Questions Presented .....	i
List of Parties to the Proceedings	
in the Courts Below .....	ii
Table of Contents .....	iii
Table of Authorities .....	v
Petition for a Writ of Certiorari .....	1
Opinions Below .....	1
Statement of Jurisdiction .....	2
Constitutional Provisions,	
Treaties, Statutes, Rules, and Regulations Involved .....	3
Statement of the Case .....	9
Reasons for Granting the Writ .....	14
1.) <b>THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT MR. ROBINSON'S PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO RESOLVE A CONFLICT AMONG THE UNITED STATES COURTS OF APPEALS AS TO THE SCOPE OF "PLAIN ERROR" REVIEW OF 'PIPELINE' <i>BOOKER</i> CASES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
1A.) <b>The Federal Courts Of Appeals Are Divided As To The Proper Remedy For Sixth Amendment Violations Under <i>Booker</i> Where The Defendant Failed To Timely Raise The Claim In The Court Of Appeals.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1B.) <b>The Sixth And Eleventh Circuits' Holdings On Waiver Of Claims Are Inconsistent With Fundamental Fairness And The Holdings Of Every Other Court Of Appeals .....</b>	<b>17</b>

<b>1C.) The District Court Should Have Had The Initial Opportunity To Review And Correct Petitioner's 'Pipeline Case' Sixth Amendment Violations Under Booker Before Affirmation Of The Sentence By The Court Of Appeals; Had The Court Of Appeals For The Sixth Circuit Applied The Law Of The Second, Third, Fourth, Seventh, Ninth, And DC Circuits, Mr. Robinson's Case Would Unquestionably Have Been Remanded To The District Court For Review Under Advisory Guidelines And His 130 Months Sentence May Well Have Been Reduced To Time Served.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Conclusion .....	24
Appendix .....	25
USCA Opinion Dated 12-20-05.....	A
USDC Judgment & Commitment Order Entered 9-26-01 .....	B
USCA Opinion Dated 11-19-04.....	C
Supreme Court GVR Order Dated 3-28-05.....	D

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<u>Page:</u>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Apprendi v. New Jersey</i> ,	
530 U.S. ___, 147 L. Ed. 2d 435, 120 S. Ct. 2348; 2000 U.S. LEXIS 4304 (6-26-00).....	10
<i>Bailey v. United States</i> ,	
516 U.S. ___, 116 S.Ct. 501, 133 L.Ed.2d 472 (1995).....	16
<i>Blakely v. Washington</i> ,	
124 S. Ct. 2531; 159 L. Ed. 2d 403; 2004 U.S. LEXIS 4573 (6-24-04).....	11
<i>Braxton v. United States</i> ,	
500 U.S. 344, 114 L.Ed.2d 385, 111 S.Ct. 1854 (1991).....	16
<i>Johnson v Zerbst</i> ,	
304 U.S. 458; 58 S. Ct. 1019; 82 L. Ed. 1461 (1938).....	18, 24
<i>Lawrence v. Chater</i> ,	
516 U.S. 163, 167-68, 133 L. Ed. 2d 545, 116 S. Ct. 604 (1996).....	24
<i>Montana v. Hall</i> ,	
481 U.S. 400, 406, 95 L.Ed.2d 354, 107 S.Ct. 1825 (1987).....	16
<i>Robinson v. United States</i> ,	
125 S.Ct. 1711; 161 L.Ed.2d 519; 2005 U.S. LEXIS 2761 (3-28-05).....	13
<i>Stinson v. United States</i> ,	
508 U.S. ___, ___ and [n. J., 123 L.Ed.2d 598, 605 and [n. 2], 113 S.Ct. 1913 (1993).....	16
<i>United States v. Ambort</i> ,	
405 F.3d 1109, 1118 (10 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).....	16

<i>United States v. Ameline,</i>	
409 F.3d 1073; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 10030	
**34-39	
(9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	15, 23
<i>United States v. Booker,</i>	
543 U. S. _____, 2005 U.S. LEXIS 628	
(1-12-05).....	11,13,22
<i>United States v. Booker,</i>	
543 U.S. _____, 160 L. Ed. 2d 621,	
125 S. Ct. 738 (2005) .....	13
<i>United States v. Childress,</i>	
58 F.3d 693, 723 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....	22
<i>United States v. Coles,</i>	
403 F.3d 764; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 5678	
**17	
(DC Cir. 4-8-05).....	15
<i>United States v. Cotton,</i>	
122 S. Ct. 1781; 152 L. Ed. 2d 860;	
2002 U.S. LEXIS 3565 (5-20-02).....	22
<i>United States v. Crosby,</i>	
397 F.3d 103; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 1699	
**38-39	
(2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 2005).....	15, 23
<i>United States v. Davis,</i>	
397 F.3d 173; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 2368	
**23-24	
(3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2005).....	15, 23
<i>United States v. Dockery,</i>	
401 F.3d 1261; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 3585	
(11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).....	17
<i>United States v. Dottery,</i>	
2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1071 (ED MI 1-24-05).....	20
<i>United States v. Ebuomwan,</i>	
992 F.2d 70, 72 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993).....	22
<i>United States v. Hamm,</i>	
400 F.3d 336; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 3796	
**9-12 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).....	15

<i>United States v. Heldeman,</i>	
402 F.3d 220, 224 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 2005) .....	15
<i>United States v. Mathes,</i>	
396 F.3d 374; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 1189	
**16-17 [n.7] (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) .....	15, 23
<i>United States v. Jenkins,</i>	
4 F.3d 1338 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993).....	21
<i>United States v. Mares,</i>	
402 F.3d 511, 520 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) .....	16
<i>United States v. Melton,</i>	
131 F.3d 1400, 1405 (10th Cir. 1997).....	21
<i>United States v. Mendoza,</i>	
464 U.S. 154, 78 L.Ed.2d 379,	
104 S.Ct. 568 (1984) .....	16
<i>United States v. Mitchell,</i>	
49 F.3d 769; 1995 U.S. App. LEXIS 6154	
(D.C. Cir. 1995) .....	20, 21
<i>United States v. Paladino,</i>	
401 F.3d 471; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 3291	
(7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).....	15, 23
<i>United States v. Patriarca,</i>	
912 F.Supp. 596 (D. Mass. 1995).....	21
<i>United States v. Picani,</i>	
406 F.3d 543; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 7445	
(8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) (en banc) .....	16
<i>United States v. Robinson,</i>	
Case No. 01-2395 (6 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 12-20-05) .....	13
<i>United States v. Rodriguez,</i>	
398 F.3d 1291, 1301 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) .....	16
<i>United States v. Saro,</i>	
24 F.3d 283, 288 (D.C. Cir. 1994).....	20
<i>United States v. Vanorden,</i>	
414 F.3d 1321; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 13035	
(11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) .....	17
<i>Williams v. United States,</i>	
503 U.S. 193; 112 S. Ct. 1112;	

<i>117 L. Ed. 2d 341;</i> <i>1992 U.S. LEXIS 1532 (1992)</i> .....	22
<b>Statutes</b>	
<i>18 U.S.C. § 1952</i> .....	<i>ii, iii, 9</i>
<i>18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)</i> .....	<i>3, 12, 19, 2</i>
<i>21 U.S.C. § 846</i> .....	<i>ii, iii, 9</i>
<i>21 U.S.C. § 853</i> .....	<i>ii, iii, 9</i>
<i>28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)</i> .....	2
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
<i>U.S.C.A. Fifth Amendment</i> .....	3
<i>U.S.C.A. Sixth Amendment</i> .....	<i>i 3, 12, 22</i>
<i>U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3</i> .....	<i>5, 20, 21</i>
<i>U.S.S.G. § 1B1.3(a)(1)(B),</i> <i>Commentary, Application Note 2</i> .....	10, 20
<b>Rules</b>	
<i>Fed. R. Crim. P. 52</i> .....	8, 22
<i>Fed. R. Crim. P. 52(b)</i> .....	15
<i>Supreme Court Rule 10</i> .....	14, 18
<i>Supreme Court Rule 10(a)</i> .....	16

## **PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Marcus Robinson, the Petitioner herein, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, entered in the above entitled case on 12-20-05.

### **OPINIONS BELOW**

The 12-20-05 opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, whose judgment is herein sought to be reviewed, is an unpublished decision, and is reprinted in the separate Appendix A to this Petition.

The prior opinion and judgment (Judgment & Commitment Order) of the United States District Court for the Eastern District Of Michigan, entered on 9-26-01, is an unpublished decision, and is reprinted in the separate Appendix B to this Petition.

The prior opinion and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the direct appeal in this case, entered on 11-19-04, is an unpublished decision reported at 116 Fed. Appx. 646; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 24320, and is reprinted in the separate Appendix C to this Petition.

The prior opinion and judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, granting certiorari, vacating and remanding to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit for further consideration in light of *United States v. Booker* is reported at 543 U.S. \_\_\_, 160 L. Ed. 2d 621, 125 S. Ct. 738 (2005) and is reprinted in the separate Appendix D to this Petition.

## **STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION**

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered on 12-20-05. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

## **CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, TREATIES, STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS INVOLVED**

The Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides in relevant part:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury... nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law ... *Id.*

The Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense. *Id.*

18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) provides:

### **§ 3553. Imposition of a sentence**

**(a) Factors to be considered in imposing a sentence.** The court shall impose a sentence sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in